

March 24, 2010

1

TOWN OF NEW WINDSOR

PLANNING BOARD

March 24, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: JERRY ARGENIO, CHAIRMAN  
NEIL SCHLESINGER  
HOWARD BROWN  
DANIEL GALLAGHER  
HENRY SCHEIBLE

ALTERNATE: HARRY FERGUSON

ALSO PRESENT: MARK EDSALL, P.E.  
PLANNING BOARD ENGINEER

JENNIFER GALLAGHER  
BUILDING INSPECTOR

NICOLE JULIAN  
PLANNING BOARD SECRETARY

DOMINIC CORDISCO, ESQ.  
PLANNING BOARD ATTORNEY

ABSENT: HENRY VAN LEEUWEN

REGULAR\_MEETING:

\_\_\_\_\_  
MR. ARGENIO: I'd like to call the Wednesday, March 24,  
2010 meeting of the Town of New Windsor Planning Board  
to order. Please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was  
recited.)

MR. ARGENIO: We're going to get going because we have a lot to get to. Jennifer is not here yet nor is Danny but we do have a lot going on. I'd like to welcome Harry Ferguson, he's the new alternate sitting in next to Jennifer. He's going to listen and pay attention hopefully and he's the guy, he's the new guy. Everybody was in that seat at one point in time or another.

APPROVAL\_OF\_MINUTES\_DATED\_2/24/10

---

MR. ARGENIO: First order of business I'd like to, if anybody sees fit, I'll accept a motion that we accept the minutes dated February 24, 2010 and sent out via e-mail on March 4, 2010 as written.

MR. SCHLESINGER: So moved.

MR. GALLAGHER: Second it.

MR. ARGENIO: Motion has been made and seconded we accept those as written.

ROLL CALL

MR. SCHEIBLE	AYE
MR. BROWN	AYE
MR. GALLAGHER	AYE
MR. SCHLESINGER	AYE
MR. ARGENIO	AYE

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

THE GROVE AT NEW WINDSOR (09-22)

MR. ARGENIO: First item on tonight's agenda is the public hearing for The Grove at New Windsor. The applicant proposes 22 new zero lot line lots on the approved Grove site plan project to establish townhomes with related property lots. The plan was previously reviewed at the 15 July, 2009 and 24 February, 2010 planning board meetings. What say you this evening, sir? What we'll do is we'll give the engineer a chance to tell us what changes he's made and update us on anything that's pertinent. Then we'll open it up to the public for any comments and then turn it back over to the board. Go ahead, sir.

MR. DATES: My name is Justin Dates from Maser Consulting. I represent the applicant for The Grove at New Windsor and our PUD application. What the applicant is looking to do is like the chairman has stated he's going to 22 fee simple lots for 22 lots along Hawthorne Way which currently aren't constructed. The construction is right now along Balsam Drive, there's five units total to date as well as the clubhouse and the amenities. What they're going to look to do is the current ownership is under condominium association, they'd like to have 22 fee simple lots which opens up FHA financing to potential owners so it makes it a little more salable in today's market. They're also looking to create based on the condo association has established condo 1 and condo 2 and a subdivision along Hawthorne Way which would split the entire site into two separate lots as well as a proposed lot for the rec area and the clubhouse. Also for the application there's a booster pump station down on Hudson Valley Avenue which would be carved out as a dedication lot to the Town of New Windsor. Since the last planning board meeting, the planning board counsel requested copies of the HOA and condo documents that

were created for the development before, we'll forward them over to him for review.

MR. ARGENIO: Okay. On the 9th day of March, 2010, Nicole compared 12 addressed envelopes containing the public hearing pertinent to the application with the list provided to her by the assessor's office. Those notices went out and the appropriate people were notified of the public hearing this evening. If anybody would like to comment on this application, please raise your hand and be recognized, you'll be afforded the opportunity to comment. Yes, sir, stand up, come forward, give your name and address to this stenographer.

MR. VISCONTI: Hi, Joseph Visconti, 923 Balsam Drive, I live in The Grove. My question is I'm not sure how this is going to affect the residents that are there at this point. Are we making the whole development smaller or are they proposing to cut the lots in half? I didn't know if it was going to affect me or any other residents in another way.

MR. ARGENIO: Answer the question.

MR. DATES: No, the original plan was approved back in 2006, none of the site design is being changed, no more units are being--

MR. ARGENIO: You know what might be helpful, if I can interrupt for a second, if you can point out about where your condo is there.

MR. VISCONTI: I'm right there, that's my unit right here.

MR. ARGENIO: Go ahead, sir.

MR. DATES: So none of the, there isn't a reduction in units or increase, the original approval is not being

changed, they're just looking to subdivide to create new lot lines for these units which aren't constructed.

MR. VISCONTI: But they're still planning to build the exact?

MR. DATES: Correct.

MR. VISCONTI: I got information that they were not going to build any of those and they may turn this into a recreation area but I could be totally misinformed.

MR. DATES: No, as of right now, the full development is still anticipated.

MR. VISCONTI: So the existing lots are not going to be changed as far as the buildings are concerned?

MR. DATES: Right now it's one single lot, there would be individual lots for all these units themselves so they would be individual tax lots. The remainder of the units would stay as is.

MR. ARGENIO: Sir, your unit will remain as it is where it is as your neighbors' units will and quite frankly, these units that the engineer is describing they'll also from a superficial point of view remain the same, this lot line change is only that, it changes property lines, no more, no less.

MR. VISCONTI: Thank you very much, appreciate it.

MR. ARGENIO: Anybody else have any questions or comments they'd like to make on this application? Yes, ma'am, please come forward. Your name and address for the benefit of the stenographer?

MS. ROSCOE: Hi, Elaine Roscoe, 412 Balsam Drive.

MR. ARGENIO: What can we do for you, Miss Roscoe?

MS. ROSCOE: Is that going to change like the amounts of the home association fees and like the new people or the new buildings that are going to come in is it still going to be an association?

MR. ARGENIO: Mr. Engineer?

MR. DATES: Yes, they would be a, the association that's been set up for the entire development would still be intact and they would still be paying into that association. Fee difference I'm not sure where they're at, I don't want to say it could go down or up but they would be paying into maintaining all of the common areas.

MR. ARGENIO: Probably something you should be keyed into, it would seem to me this is a public hearing, you certainly didn't expect people not to show up.

MR. DATES: No, of course not.

MR. ARGENIO: It's a perfectly reasonable question.

MR. DATES: But they would still be paying into the association similar to yourself.

MS. ROSCOE: So, it's, everything is going to stay the same? It's just the property lines, that's what you're talking about?

MR. DATES: Correct, creating individual lots for these units here, this is Hawthorne Way, here's Balsam.

MS. ROSCOE: So--

MR. DATES: So just these two.

MS. ROSCOE: What happens to all the rest? They're still going to be those?

MR. DATES: They're proposing to build those and they would stay as per the original plan.

MS. ROSCOE: So why are they just changing them?

MR. DATES: It makes some financing available to potential buyers and they're trying to increase the sales to get some more units constructed.

MS. ROSCOE: Thank you.

MR. ARGENIO: Thank you, ma'am. Anybody else? Dan?

MR. GALLAGHER: Close the public hearing.

MR. BROWN: Second it.

MR. ARGENIO: Motion has been made and seconded we close the public hearing.

MR. CORDISCO: Before that--

MR. ARGENIO: Okay, okay. Motion has been made and the motion has been seconded. Dominic, go ahead.

MR. CORDISCO: You'll see before you that I have prepared a memo, Mr. Dates has been helpful since the last meeting when the issue regarding the impact of this application and how it relates to the existing condominium would be addressed. Mr. Dates has been very helpful, he has provided us a copy of the 2008 condominium documents that were created for the original approvals. However, in reviewing those, they raise a number of questions that I have that I think are significant that are legal issues regarding the ownership and the relationship between these new subdivided lots and the existing condominium lots. I think that the document itself appears to have a number of errors in it. The plans that are attached to that

document show that there are going to be two condominium areas and the existing condominium and the buildings that are already up are called condo area 1 but this area that's going to have subdivided lots is in an area called condo area 2. The document itself that sets out the rights and obligations of everyone that lives there refers solely to condo area 1 so it is not clear at all that anyone that's going to be in the subdivision area is going to have the obligation and responsibilities to participate in the maintenance of all the common areas and how that's going to be addressed and paid for. So I think that those are open issues and they're significant open issues that have to be addressed in any event before the board proceeds to approval. I'm hesitant for the board at this point to close the public hearing because as you know that starts a time clock of 62 days for you to consider and grant final approval, if you don't grant final approval within 62 days, the applicant is entitled to a default approval in that case in which case these answers or these questions may not be answered. Given that, it would be my recommendation at this point to keep the public hearing open.

MR. ARGENIO: Unless the applicant waives the 62 days.

MR. CORDISCO: The applicant and if Mr. Dates has the authority to bind the applicant he can waive the 62 days. I would prefer that that would be in writing from the applicant however.

MR. ARGENIO: You represent yourself as having that authority?

MR. DATES: No, sir.

MR. ARGENIO: You don't represent as having that authority?

MR. DATES: Well, I'd like to have the applicant's



attorney speak with counsel about--

MR. ARGENIO: We're going to leave the public hearing open then.

MR. DATES: That's fine, I think what he's brought up should be discussed.

MR. CORDISCO: And in all fairness, these are legal issues that the applicant's attorney should be re-visiting with us and in addition at a minimum it appears that the existing condominium document needs to be revised just so the board is aware that that requires approval by the Attorney General's office so there is a process there. We prepared a memo which we'll provide a copy to Justin along with the technical comments on the plans so they can understand what the issues are here and these are fairly significant because when you're dealing with the condominium it's really one entity, you know, the people who came up here and spoke tonight they own shares in that condominium which is one entity so it's one lot owner and what they're proposing to do here and it's perfectly normal for them to propose it is to create individual lots for the person who occupies a particular unit will own that individual lot in fee, the same way somebody owns, you own your homes. But what's left unanswered, however, is there are common areas, there are sidewalks, there are streets, there are roofs, there's utilities, how those are maintained by these new owners is not at all clear from the existing documents and it's something that we need to nail down because otherwise, somebody else is going to be left holding the bag.

MR. ARGENIO: I think I'm okay with all of that. That said, Danny, if you see fit to make a motion that we table this public hearing and leave it open.

MR. GALLAGHER: I'd like to make a motion that we leave

the public hearing open at this time.

MR. SCHLESINGER: Second it.

MR. ARGENIO: Motion has been made and seconded.

ROLL CALL

MR. SCHEIBLE	AYE
MR. BROWN	AYE
MR. GALLAGHER	AYE
MR. SCHLESINGER	AYE
MR. ARGENIO	AYE

MR. ARGENIO: This is important stuff that he's talking about and if you remember, I questioned the wisdom of peeling that recreation line out, I certainly would hate to see that go for taxes at a later date, that's something you guys might want to consider but in the meantime, the document needs to be in a level of fitness that will satisfy our attorney, we're not there.

MR. DATES: Understood.

MR. ARGENIO: What else can I do for you?

MR. DATES: We'll get in touch with Dominic and see what we can do to clear that up.

MR. ARGENIO: You guys have anything else you want to comment? Danny? Howard?

MR. SCHEIBLE: I agree with what you just recommended and I drove up through there and I walked the area a little bit and I cannot understand the separation of this recreation area from the entire area there, I just don't understand it. And until our legal can come up with a reasoning behind all this and your legal then I'd be more satisfied but at the moment right now I'm

not satisfied with the separation.

MR. SCHLESINGER: I just wanted to say there were two people that voiced some sort of concern at the public hearing and one lady in the back you walked away, you asked a question but from my point of view, both of your concerns and both of your questions were very significant and I think what we're doing here now we have the same concerns that you do and I want you to know that even though you walked away and said okay, we're not saying okay and I just want you to understand what we're proceeding with what we're doing.

MR. DATES: I did jot those down.

MR. ARGENIO: Thank you for coming in. Dominic, get a look at the document, let's get it squared away, okay?

MR. CORDISCO: Fair enough.

REGULAR\_ITEMS:

NEW\_WINDSOR\_SENIOR\_SITE\_PLAN\_AMENDMENT\_(10-06)

MR. ARGENIO: Next regular item, next on tonight's agenda is New Windsor Senior site plan amendment on Route 32, this is a ZBA referral. I see Mr. Mandelbaum here and his esteemed associate.

MR. EWALD: Travis Ewald from Pietrzak and Pfau doing the surveying, this project was approved in 2008 for 91 total units. That being 90 affordable housing units and one superintendent's unit with variances granted to allow for 25 units per acre and a reduction in the number of parking spaces.

MR. ARGENIO: That's not what I have here, I have here that a variance was granted to increase the number of units from 66 to 91, is that not correct?

MR. EWALD: That's correct.

MR. ARGENIO: Okay.

MR. EWALD: The unit count was 25 units per acre. And the total number of parking spaces was 66. We're proposing two additional units and two additional parking spaces. The overall site density would not change as the original approval rounds up to 25 units per acre, it was 24 point and change what we're proposing.

MR. ARGENIO: That's not the way it's written but that's okay.

MR. EWALD: What we're proposing is similar site density of which rounds it up is 25 units per acre.

MR. ARGENIO: Got it.

MR. EWALD: And the density of parking spaces per unit is, would be slightly greater than what was originally approved. We're not proposing any modification to the site with the exception of two additional units, two additional units inside the building, the building will not change in the exterior dimensions and the only site changes that we're proposing is two additional parking spaces.

MR. ARGENIO: I'm listening.

MR. MANDELBAUM: Let me fill you in a little bit more about where the two units came about. On the original plan that we submitted to the building department those particular units showed storage one above each other and the identical size and shape to the unit that is existing in the building so we had an overwhelming application, we're full, so we have decided that since we have plenty of storage in the building of course there's a lot of, because of the response we received we decided to get these units finished, they're not occupied at all, they're empty until such time that we get approval from this board so we have more people than we have units.

MR. ARGENIO: Are you a hundred percent rented?

MR. MANDELBAUM: A hundred percent.

MR. ARGENIO: I got a nice letter from a lady as everybody knows.

MR. MANDELBAUM: Only one?

MR. ARGENIO: I did get a couple but I got a particular letter from a particular woman who was actually my tutor from eighth grade, she didn't remember me or know from Adam but she sent a beautiful letter to the Chairman of the Planning Board saying thank you for approving this project, so happy I can still live in

New Windsor and I don't have to move to another community, et cetera which was nice.

MR. MANDELBAUM: Well, that's the reason we do this, try to keep people in the community, that's the whole intention.

MR. ARGENIO: Yeah, let's look at this whole thing, I mean, this is two units in this facility, couple pages in on your comments you'll see we have Amber Grove that's also Mr. Mandelbaum's application, it's my understanding, and that's response to what's out there, there's a demand, an outcry for places to live for seniors, places they can afford.

MR. VISCONTI: We have over 300 names for 91 apartments and all from local community, we did not advertise at all.

MR. ARGENIO: Do you guys have anything? I don't have to ask you, I know what you're going to say. I said my piece, I'm not going to beat it to death, what he's here for tonight is to get recommended to the ZBA for them to make a determination on whether he should get those extra two units or not and they'll make that determination. But is there any, this is pretty straightforward.

MR. EDSALL: Just one note for the record if it was a conventional senior housing project, the inside storage issue is a code related issue. Because it was totally affordable, that particular classification under the law doesn't require the storage that they provided as an extra item and obviously for the demand now they're taking those two spaces that were--

MR. ARGENIO: So we don't have a code issue?

MR. EDSALL: The only issue is the additional units and in doing so, the zoning board will recognize that for

each of the two units added they're not increasing the non-conformity for parking, they are in fact providing spaces for each of those.

MR. MANDELBAUM: Correct.

MR. ARGENIO: You got that? Go ahead.

MR. EDSALL: That's it.

MR. SCHEIBLE: How's the parking situation presently in this, is there enough room?

MR. MANDELBAUM: So far, we have enough room, more people will be moving in April 1st to the next building.

MR. SCHEIBLE: Do you have enough room to handle everyone?

MR. MANDELBAUM: We have more room for cars and every person that moves in we don't know if they have a car or not. As of today, I can tell you for the new building there are more spaces than cars.

MR. BROWN: Right now?

MR. MANDELBAUM: Right now.

MR. BROWN: After everyone has moved in?

MR. MANDELBAUM: When they move in April 1st we'll have more spaces.

MR. BROWN: How many spaces now?

MR. MANDELBAUM: Sixty-eight.

MR. BROWN: There will be after this how many?

MR. MANDELBAUM: Sixty-eight.

MR. ARGENIO: The unit count would go from 91 to 93 so what he's talking about is two units and remember what we're here for tonight, guys, we're here to recommend this to the zoning board and they'll do their bit and then he'll come back here.

MR. MANDELBAUM: Most people with the 30 percent income do not have a car.

MR. ARGENIO: I would think that would be a reasonable statement. Dan?

MR. GALLAGHER: No, I have nothing but positive things.

MR. SCHLESINGER: I'll make a motion to declare the application incomplete. I also have many positive things. I'll make a motion that deems the application incomplete.

MR. BROWN: Second it.

MR. ARGENIO: Motion has been made and seconded. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

MR. SCHEIBLE	AYE
MR. BROWN	AYE
MR. GALLAGHER	AYE
MR. SCHLESINGER	AYE
MR. ARGENIO	AYE

MR. SCHLESINGER: I just wanted to say, reiterating what you said, I've heard so many positive things about it from the beginning, from the get-go we thought it was a positive thing, I don't know what the zoning board will do, I don't know how you meet the code and everything but other than that, I would send this to



the zoning board with a positive recommendation.

MR. MANDELBAUM: Thank you.

MR. ARGENIO: This is a difficult spot, we've heard a bit of noise about the parking from credible people but I've driven in there myself couple of times, I have to tell you to be frank with you I see spots available.

MR. MANDELBAUM: I can tell you that--

MR. ARGENIO: Couple of times that I drove by there it wasn't a mob scene with people parking up and down the road, that's what I saw.

MR. MANDELBAUM: Everybody wants to park next to the front door, they don't want to walk 25 feet, that I can't help.

MR. ARGENIO: They're not fit like you.

MR. MANDELBAUM: Some of them can dance around both of us.

MR. ARGENIO: You've been referred to the zoning board at this point in time with what I think is a positive spin from the planning board. Good luck to you.

MR. MANDELBAUM: Thank you.

MR. EWALD: Thank you very much.

AMBER\_GROVE\_SUBDIVISION\_(10-08)

---

MR. ARGENIO: Amber Grove subdivision.

Travis Ewald from Pietrzak and Pfau appeared before the board for this proposal.

MR. ARGENIO: Next on tonight's agenda is Amber Grove subdivision on Route 94 and Forge Hill Road. It's a two lot subdivision of 46 plus acre parcel. The application proposes two lot subdivision of 46 acre parcel at the corner of 94 and Forge Hill Road. The plan was reviewed on a concept basis only. Now we're going to look at this plan here tonight but let's keep in mind that there are two applications here, it's this one and the one that's going to come after it. The meat on this application is on the second application but from a procedural point of view, we have to look at it as two separate items. Go ahead, guys.

MR. EWALD: We're proposing a two lot minor subdivision on the parcel that was now or formally the St. Helena Church along New York State Route 94 and Forge Hill Road. What we propose to do is subdivide off a five acre parcel right at the intersection to provide for space for affordable senior housing. We have provided, it's in the R-4 zone, we have provided bulk tables for a place of worship under this zone and for a total affordable senior housing facility for the smaller five acre lot. Both proposed parcels exceed drastically all the required bulk requirements.

MR. ARGENIO: As I said earlier, the meat of this package is the second application which is the subdivision or the site plan application so if we're gonna talk about the public hearing which I think we should be talking about I think we should be talking about it for the next application cause that's where the meat is. Dominic?

MR. EDSALL: We're just trying to discuss the timing of the public hearing and just conferring with counsel that procedurally that occurs after the initial referral over to the Town Board.

MR. ARGENIO: Well speak about it, that's exactly what I was going to ask you about.

MR. EDSALL: Want me to continue?

MR. ARGENIO: Yes, procedurally.

MR. EDSALL: I'm going to mix the two together because functionally the subdivision is just a formality effectively because as you said, the meat is the site plan and I'm assuming that you're going to want to join them for SEQRA. With that in mind for the total project including the senior housing, you have to once that's deemed as a complete application and suitably complete so that you can refer it out it goes to Orange County Planning, you do your lead agency circulation and you send it to the Town Board.

MR. ARGENIO: When it goes to Orange County Planning don't these two go together?

MR. EDSALL: Yes, we'll send this as two actions or one action on SEQRA, two applications, a subdivision and a site plan.

MR. CORDISCO: Correct, the county would receive both sets of plans.

MR. ARGENIO: In the same envelope?

MR. EDSALL: Yes, we'll send them together.

MR. CORDISCO: Save the postage.

MR. EDSALL: Every penny counts.

MR. ARGENIO: Is that alright? Go ahead, Mark.

MR. EDSALL: So the bottom line is that as you'll see in my next set of comments for the site plan really the issue is is there additional information you want added to the plans so that it's complete. And there's a couple things they need to give us so that you can then circulate for lead agency, send it to the county planning and send it to the Town Board with the board's consensus on appropriate location and being a complete application. So again merging the two subdivision and site plan, that's your next activity.

MR. ARGENIO: Let me get ahead of myself a little bit. The five pages Mark it would seem to me that most of this technical list that I've not gone through that I quite frankly don't care to go through.

MR. EDSALL: And you shouldn't.

MR. ARGENIO: Most of this technical list should be remedied before this gets circulated, wouldn't you think?

MR. EDSALL: For site plan?

MR. ARGENIO: Yes.

MR. EDSALL: As I mentioned in our discussions earlier once they start reviewing the plans if I found something that needs to be cleaned up, I made the list because my idea is that if I can help them get plans as near complete early we save the trouble later. I would say that probably a third of the comments on the technical review for the site plan really should be taken care of when it goes to the county because it will save them from asking questions, make the review quicker if you can knock off the majority so much the better. It makes it more complete when it goes to the

Town Board so I won't say all of them are important now but a lot of them are pretty darn easy just to fix.

MR. ARGENIO: Let's get this reset a little bit back on to the subdivision, you guys are looking at a subdivision plan. We're going to need to circulate for lead agency, Mark, is that right on this?

MR. EDSALL: We're going to if acceptable to the board and counsel we'll do it as a single action being subdivision and site plan.

MR. CORDISCO: Correct.

MR. EDSALL: So yes we'll circulate lead agency but again my recommendation is you don't send it to the county and don't do lead agency until one round of corrections are made so the plans are that much better.

MR. EWALD: To be quite frank since we have submitted the plans we have been diligently working on the design of the project, we want to get the initial submission to the board so we can get any comments on just the conceptual location of certain items, parking, building.

MR. ARGENIO: So what you're saying you know the plans are somewhat deficient?

MR. EWALD: The ones that have been submitted. Since then, we have done hydrant testing, we have designed the hydrant, sewer, storm water, developing full storm water pollution prevention plan.

MR. ARGENIO: Just hold it and if you guys have any questions, just jump in, please, okay, Mark so on the subdivision application and the subdivision application only, what else, what do we need to do tonight on that application? Can't we just go to the site plan and talk about the site plan and if we're going to

circulate the subdivision's included?

MR. EDSALL: Looking at my comments, the comments are very minor in nature for the subdivision, I'd say move on to the site plan.

MR. ARGENIO: Okay, that's what I'm trying to get to. So turn to the next Amber Grove senior site plan.

AMBER\_GROVE\_SENIOR\_SITE\_PLAN\_(10-07)

---

MR. ARGENIO: Okay, you want to tell us what you're doing here?

MR. EWALD: We're proposing 84 totally affordable senior housing units on approximately five acres with one additional superintendent's unit. We're proposing to exceed the required zoning for one parking space per unit I believe it would be on the current design is 89 units total spaces for a total of 85 units. We're proposing access off Forge Hill Road slightly south east of the entrance for the Fort Knox. We're proposing a pedestrian access across New York State Route 94 on the north east side of the intersection and then again across Forge Hill Road connecting into the sidewalk system that's at the intersection of 94 and Forge Hill.

MR. ARGENIO: Mr. Mandelbaum, I believe you're in a historical district.

MR. MANDELBAUM: I don't know.

MR. ARGENIO: I think you are and the reason I say that is you mentioned Knox's Headquarters, I got a letter from the Palisades Interstate Park Commission here and I'm not going to read the whole thing but I'm going to give you, we respectfully request to be included in the list of interested agencies for this project, we manage Knox Headquarters, it's a state historic site, it's adjacent to the project and we're requesting the opportunity to review and comment. Now, they want to review and comment but there's a timeframe on that too, their time to comment. Go ahead, sir.

MR. EWALD: We're proposing the water service for the building to connect into the existing, I believe it's a 10 inch water main which is located on the northern side of Route 94 and what we're proposing is sewer

service to connect into the existing sewer that runs along Forge Hill Road. We'll provide for storm water treatment on the southeastern portion of the lot which will discharge into the existing roadside swale.

MR. ARGENIO: Going to open cut 94, are they going to make you drill?

MR. EWALD: Depends on what the DOT says.

MR. MANDELBAUM: We'll leave that to the DOT.

MR. ARGENIO: I want to read this, the application appears to include all items, all items with the exception of the narrative and the unit data table, these should be added as part of the next submittal. That's Mark's comments. Quantity of bedrooms this is me speaking now, not reading from Mark's comments, the amenities you're offering, the unit count, if you have any community rooms or common areas that should be annunciated in that narrative.

MR. SCHEIBLE: I look at this as probably one of the most visible and desirable pieces of property in New Windsor because of the visibility. I'm glad Knox Headquarters, these people sent in that little blurb to you that somehow, some way the architecture blends in with the neighborhood somehow to enhance it, make it look more not as a bunch of buildings sticking up in the air but so it looks a little bit more enhancible (sic.) to the surrounding area.

MR. MANDELBAUM: I don't know if you have an architectural review board.

MR. ARGENIO: Right here.

MR. MANDELBAUM: We can work with you with colors and things like that.



MR. ARGENIO: Yeah, I think that Henry brings up a good point, if you guys would consider doing some kind of rendering so we can see what kind of colors and finishes you're using. And I don't want you to think that you're being singled out. Typically, if we have a building of any consequence that's going to go up anywhere in that 300, Route 300 corridor we would require or we have required them to submit to us some kind of a rendering.

MR. MANDELBAUM: We'll be happy to do that.

MR. ARGENIO: You've been here before, there's nobody here that's unreasonable, just looking for something that reasonably blends into the landscaping.

MR. MANDELBAUM: We'll do that and also what we'll do we'll add as much landscaping between on both sides of the road as much as the board requires.

MR. ARGENIO: You know what we're going to focus on.

MR. EDSALL: Mr. Chairman, just I believe that not only is the 300 corridor one of the historic zones but I believe Forge Hill on the zoning map is identified as historic headquarter because of couple of the cultural resources so really have to address it.

MR. ARGENIO: There used to be a mint down there, did you know that?

MR. MANDELBAUM: We better start digging.

MR. CORDISCO: As a result of it being not only in the historic corridor but also adjacent to the Knox Village, Knox Headquarters, excuse me, the project under SEQRA would be deemed Type I and the ramifications of that is you have to circulate for lead agency and you have to submit a long form EAF. They have already submitted a long form EAF, we already know

that we have to circulate for lead agency. But in terms of checking off the box, we have to make sure that we check off the box for a Type I action and take a close look at all of the potential environmental impacts as part of that. Now in regards to the Palisades Interstate Park Commission letter when you receive a letter like that from an agency which is an agency that doesn't have any approval authority over the project but they're expressing an interest in it at this stage it would be proper and it would be the legal thing to do would be to include them on the lead agency circulation, they could not be lead agency because they have no approval authority but SEQRA encourages input from other interested agencies early on in the process so they should be included in the circulation as well.

MR. ARGENIO: Okay, I think we can do that. You have to turn that dumpster enclosure 90 degrees.

MR. GALLAGHER: You mentioned a 10 inch line for water?

MR. EWALD: We're going to connect into the 10 inch, we're proposing 8 for water and sewer.

MR. MANDELBAUM: Give you background basically I'm sure all of you drove to the housing we have now, it's basically a similar building and obviously we can bring the colors much more earthtone and so on so whatever the board feels the color would be correct, I think the major thing we can put a lot of trees in front, don't put small trees, put 6 to 10 foot high.

MR. SCHLESINGER: Stone work.

MR. MANDELBAUM: Stone work, something like that, stone wall in the front, put trees behind the stone wall that start at 8 to 10 foot so in a few years they're 20 feet or pines so we can hide the building more. I would, obviously, we're not planning to cut, just to be aware all the trees we have here and here we're not planning

to cut them obviously everything that's not dead we're going to leave alone.

MR. SCHEIBLE: You have some large growth in that area.

MR. MANDELBAUM: On the corner there's a lot of thick dense so we're not planning to touch it at all, just leave the mature trees that are 50 foot right now and between the parking lot and the trees we can put additional evergreens so in the wintertime not one row, two, maybe three rows so it will keep additional blockage from the road itself.

MR. EDSALL: Perhaps on the grading plan if you have areas where you already determined where you want to leave undisturbed it might be worthwhile to call out the areas to remain undisturbed that will help these folks to get a feeling.

MR. MANDELBAUM: This corner where you get the most visible by the traffic light really this whole area here originally we had a different layout but I decided to move it away from the corner away from this intersection cause this is really where everybody stops basically so I can put a lot of trees here and leave them here, trees that are going to be taller than the building itself eventually.

MR. GALLAGHER: The units themselves are they going to be similar?

MR. MANDELBAUM: Identical, all identical units, all one bedroom except for the super, everything else is the same, the amenities inside is the same, identical to what you have. And if the board likes one evening I will be happy to take you inside so you can visualize and see what you have done, I don't think all of you have been inside the buildings.

MR. ARGENIO: Mark, is there anything else procedurally

that we need to go through here?

MR. EDSALL: No. I would suggest that they go through the list, sounds as if they've done a lot of work in the interim, get as many of these things done, eventually you're going to do, might as well get them out of the way, get it back in with a short narrative so that we can say you've done what the code says we asked for and then we can--

MR. ARGENIO: We're not pulling our hair out because there's not a lot to look at.

MR. MANDELBAUM: Just wanted to give you the conceptual to let you know what the idea is.

MR. ARGENIO: I think one of the most important things we talked about here tonight is what Henry Scheible brought up and that's and Neil too brought up about is maintaining the old growth, if you do some nice stone walls at the front with some nice landscaping around that will go a long ways, take your time and draw it in nice, give us some details on what the walls are going to look like and as I said, I'd like to see the architectural renderings.

MR. SCHEIBLE: Continue that there's a wall there we can continue it.

MR. MANDELBAUM: Just put a little more cement behind it so it doesn't move.

MR. ARGENIO: I just had one of them built at the house, you better be careful what you promise until you find out what it costs. What else?

MR. EDSALL: That's it.

METROPCS\_SITE\_PLAN\_(10-05)

---

MR. ARGENIO: Next is MetroPCS.

MR. FURST: John Furst, F-U-R-S-T, I'm an attorney with Cuddy & Feder, we represent applicant MetroPCS.

MR. ARGENIO: This application proposes to co-locate onto an existing tower at the referenced location. The application was reviewed on a concept basis only.

MR. FURST: MetroPCS submitted an application for special use and site plan approval to co-locate a wireless telecommunications facility on the existing monopole at 570 Toleman Road. Just in case any of the board members aren't familiar with MetroPCS they're licensed with the FCC to provide digital wireless personal communication services in Orange County. They provide the same services as AT&T, T-Mobile, Verizon and all the other carriers you're familiar with. This FCC license requires them to build out the network in Orange County and the granting of this license shows that there are, there's a need, even though there's some existing carriers the FCC said so MetroPCS needs to a build a network here. They have them existing in Dallas, Fort Worth, as well as Florida so they're new to the area, they're building their infrastructure from scratch, they just went on air in New York City and working their way up. This specific facility seeks to provide reliable service along Toleman Road, Route 207, Drury Lane and Station Road. The premises where it's going to be located is zoned office light industrial, like I said, there's an existing 147 foot 10 inch tower on the property. Right now, you've got Sprint, Nextel, T-Mobile and I believe Verizon was just constructed. This board recently approved them back in the fall and I think they just put up their antennas so you've got three carriers, we're going to be the fourth carrier. MetroPCS's facility is going to include six panel antennas at a center line height of 115 feet above

ground level so they're going to be the lowest one on there, they're not increasing the height of the tower and again we're going to be the lowest of the existing carriers.

MR. ARGENIO: Any additions to the building on the ground?

MR. FURST: You're one step ahead of me, that's next. On the ground they're going to be placing five equipment cabinets, they're unmanned, they're actually going to be going on an existing concrete pad, the concrete pad is 7 x 13 1/2 feet. So they're just basically flopping these equipment cabinets on this concrete pad and it's all going to be within the existing fenced in compound at the base of the tower right next to where Sprint, Nextel and Verizon are already located so not expanding the compound at the base and again we're not putting in a shelter, just putting equipment cabinets that will go on top of an existing concrete slab. Now, under the town's wireless regulations, they prefer a shared use of existing tall structures over the construction of new towers so we're using the town's preferred method by co-locating on I believe this is an approved tower and in fact when you have co-location on approved towers there's a section of the code that permits this application by site plan review only. But we're instructed to file for the special use permit and the site plan approval but I think in any event this application will comply with both the requirements. It has a minimal visual impact, like I said MetroPCS is going to be the lowest of the existing carriers and 10 antennas are about the same size as the existing antennas. In fact, we have six where many other carriers have even more than that. We're not extending the height of the towers so we're going to have a minimal visual impact, traffic is not going to be an issue, it's only going to require a MetroPCS technician to come out there once a month, the site is going to be monitored from a remote location

24-7 and in addition, there's going to be a minimal ground disturbance since we're going on an existing concrete slab.

MR. ARGENIO: Do you have to bring anymore power in?

MR. FURST: Yes, yes, I'll have the engineer answer that question, he can probably give you a better explanation.

MR. PAPAY: The proposed installation requires only electric and telephone services, there's existing electric and telephone services on site which will drive the proposed installation.

MR. ARGENIO: So you don't have to bring anymore power in?

MR. PAPAY: Not for the utility, no, we, just to bring it from the existing demark to our equipment.

MR. ARGENIO: Where is the demark?

MR. PAPAY: Demark is within the existing compound.

MR. ARGENIO: That's fine, it's within the fence?

MR. PAPAY: Right.

MR. ARGENIO: That's what I'm trying to get.

MR. SCHEIBLE: Sir, I have a question, just a technical question, since you're the engineer. How low can you go? We're coming down that pole, well say right now how low can you possibly go to be usable or are we reaching the point where there won't be anymore? My question is will another year from now somebody else come in and want to know if they can put another one in there below that level?

MR. PAPAY: Typically, 115 feet works with existing obstructions in the area, trees and things of that nature. So that if you get below the tree line you start getting interference from trees. Obviously, the lower you go, the less coverage you get with the antennas themselves. So that 115 feet works for MetroPCS. What has happened over the years is that used to be everybody wanted to be high to get the most amount of coverage but then there's only so many frequencies that could be used and those frequencies would have to be reused so you want to get lower and have more sites so you can reuse those frequencies so there's a balance there as well.

MR. SCHLESINGER: Two questions relative to Hank's question. You're going to be the lowest antenna on the tower. How much space is there between your antenna and the one above you?

MR. PAPAY: Verizon is the next carrier and they're at 130 feet. Our proposed center line elevation is 115 feet so there's 15 feet in between the center lines, 10 foot is usually the minimum.

MR. SCHLESINGER: From an engineering point of view some company comes next year and says they want to put an antenna on that tower, is there room for them to do it?

MR. PAPAY: There's room below our proposed antennas to locate at 105 feet above grade depending on the frequencies they may be able to sneak in.

MR. SCHLESINGER: My second question is equipment cabinets on the bottom, I'm sure there's going to be equipment, I have no clue what kind of equipment, is it, are they possibly, can they make noise, can they be like a transformer that can catch on fire?

MR. PAPAY: No, they're radio cabinets, on site now



there's a 60 x 60 foot compound, there are two equipment shelters there that you can, that have doors you can walk into.

MR. SCHLESINGER: Neighboring people have any concern about anything that can possibly be emitted from those cabinets, whether it be sound, odor, smell, whatever it may be?

MR. PAPAY: Makes no odor, makes minimal amount of noise.

MR. SCHLESINGER: No humming?

MR. PAPAY: No.

MR. ARGENIO: The antennas emit a radio frequency?

MR. PAPAY: Yes.

MR. ARGENIO: Is that more or less powerful than the antennas that are up there already?

MR. PAPAY: They're equivalent. And typically, there's studies, safety studies done for these type of sites where the allowable exposure, well exposure emitted from the antennas is a fraction of one percent of the allowable exposure.

MR. FURST: We sent in a report as Exhibit D, they have done a cumulative analysis of the emissions so they've taken our proposed emissions from MetroPCS as well as the emissions from the existing carriers and report concludes that even using worst case scenarios they're going to be 100 times below the FCC levels so it's less than one percent.

MR. ARGENIO: Anybody have anything else?

MR. SCHEIBLE: So all the other antennas above you

right now are being brought down to the existing Nextel equipment shelter, is that correct?

MR. PAPAY: No.

MR. SCHEIBLE: I mean you have three antennas already.

MR. PAPAY: Right, there's three separate arrays up there now, very top is Sprint, Nextel that goes to the Sprint Nextel shelter, after that is T-Mobile that goes to the T-Mobile equipment cabinets that are on site and then the third would be Verizon Wireless that goes to the 12 x 30 foot Verizon shelter.

MR. SCHEIBLE: I'm looking down at the bottom here says existing Nextel equipment shelter but it doesn't say anything about Verizon or anyone else so am I looking at the right one?

MR. PAPAY: If you look on the plan before this one shows the plan view so that here's Nextel, this is T-Mobile, this is Verizon, this is where MetroPCS is proposing.

MR. BROWN: Who owns the pole to start off with?

MR. PAPAY: Who owns the pole? I believe Sprint Nextel built it, whether they owned it or sold it to a wireless manager of sorts.

MR. FURST: It's owned by Tower Co. Assets LLC.

MR. BROWN: They lease it to all the companies?

MR. PAPAY: Right.

MR. ARGENIO: Okay, this all went out to county a few days ago, these folks are going to be back again because we cannot act without hearing from the county by statute so think about it, I think we covered it

pretty thoroughly tonight. Anybody have anything else?

MR. FURST: If I can make a request?

MR. ARGENIO: You can make a request.

MR. FURST: I request that the board waive the need for the public hearing as you did for Verizon last fall, you have that ability and authority under the zoning law.

MR. ARGENIO: Mark, I don't see a comment here about this.

MR. EDSALL: No, and if you look under the second paragraph comment one I'm acknowledging what Mr. Furst said under 300-28 (C) (2), it indicates that when you do in fact co-locate on existing approved facilities it is not a special permit, it's only a site plan so--

MR. ARGENIO: We went through the exact same thing with the last folks.

MR. EDSALL: With that determination on record, then you can in fact as a purely site plan application decide if you want a public hearing or not and it would appear that this is absolutely consistent with what's desired and what's there already so it may make sense to just consider the waiver like you did for Verizon.

MR. CORDISCO: Mr. Furst first was absolutely correct saying that the town's law does prefer co-location and as a result encourages it in a sense that special use permit is not required and the public hearing could be waived.

MR. ARGENIO: Public hearing, Danny, any thoughts?

MR. GALLAGHER: Did we waive it prior?

MR. ARGENIO: Yes, to hearing from Orange County?  
Orange County doesn't have anything to do with it.

MR. SCHLESINGER: Make a motion we waive.

MR. ARGENIO: I want to hear--

MR. BROWN: Waived.

MR. SCHEIBLE: I have no problem with that.

MR. SCHLESINGER: Make a motion we waive the public  
hearing.

MR. SCHEIBLE: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. SCHEIBLE	AYE
MR. BROWN	AYE
MR. GALLAGHER	AYE
MR. SCHLESINGER	AYE
MR. ARGENIO	AYE

MR. ARGENIO: Should we go any further with this?

MR. EDSALL: You can do number 3, there are no other  
involved agencies, you can't conclude SEQRA but you  
could take lead agency.

MR. ARGENIO: Next time.

MEMBERSHIP\_MODEL\_CAR\_CLUB\_(YANNONE)\_SITE\_PLAN\_(10-09)

---

MR. ARGENIO: Next is Membership Model Car Club. The plan was reviewed on a concept basis only. I see Ray Yannone walking up to represent this. His reputation precedes him.

Mr. Raymond Yannone and Mr. Vincent Yannone appeared before the board for this proposal.

MR. YANNONE: Thanks.

MR. ARGENIO: Could be a problem.

MR. R. YANNONE: So basically I think most here are probably familiar with the site Yannone Service Center, he's been there since when, 1980?

MR. V. YANNONE: Thirty years.

MR. R. YANNONE: The map I attached here with the yellow highlights are structures that are going to be removed from the property.

MR. ARGENIO: Ray, you've got to do better with the drawing, man, it's confusing, very confusing. Who did this?

MR. R. YANNONE: Dick DeKay.

MR. ARGENIO: Go ahead.

MR. R. YANNONE: So what I have, you can see it a little better, gas canopy, the blue structure that's basically the snowmobile, was a snowmobile shop, series of storage buildings, like metal containers that are going to be removed from the property and I would like to relocate the slot car track that he leases in Vails Gate now to the same site so he's going to discontinue all the uses that are here now and reconfigure the

building so it will be one continuous facade.

MR. ARGENIO: Ray, it's confusing, point to the, I don't need, everybody has to see it, point to the uses that are going to be discontinued and enunciate what they are.

MR. R. YANNONE: The canopy for the gas tank.

MR. ARGENIO: It goes.

MR. R. YANNONE: Gas tanks are gone, pumps are gone.

MR. ARGENIO: Canopy's going to go?

MR. R. YANNONE: Canopy's going to be removed. The blue framed building that was the sign shop and snowmobile shop are going to be removed.

MR. ARGENIO: Okay.

MR. R. YANNONE: The propane filling station is going to be removed, the series of steel storage structures that are highlighted in yellow are going to be removed.

MR. ARGENIO: What's being stored there, bulk tires?

MR. R. YANNONE: Car parts.

MR. ARGENIO: They're going?

MR. R. YANNONE: Off-site, gone.

MR. ARGENIO: That's a good thing.

MR. R. YANNONE: The framed shed that's attached to the existing service bays are going to be removed, it's going to be taken down.

MR. ARGENIO: Now point to where you're going to do the

addition.

MR. R. YANNONE: Now we're going to go to the top so what we were going to do the existing block garage 30 x 45 feet will remain, we're going to create an angled entrance which is going to continue not exactly at a right angle but follow the property line approximately 60 feet. This is going to be entrance area, a store front side door and this is going to be primarily used for the slot car track.

MR. ARGENIO: What's it going to be secondarily used for?

MR. R. YANNONE: The office for the service station is going to be right in the center, like a center lobby so there will be no doorway over here anymore, that will be eliminated. So you walk into one common area, Vinny will be in the middle, have control over people going wherever they're going to go and then the service station repair shop will remain on one side and the other side will be the slot cars.

MR. SCHLESINGER: Wait, Sportsplex, where is Sportsplex?

MR. R. YANNONE: Right there.

MR. SCHLESINGER: Right next door?

MR. R. YANNONE: Yes. So the area we're going to be removing about 3,300 square feet of various structures from the property.

MR. ARGENIO: How big is the building going to be?

MR. R. YANNONE: The building is going to be 49'8". So the addition itself is going to be 3,600 square feet and when it's complete it will appear to be a continuous, it's not going to look like an addition,

we're going to have a continuous facade and nice entrance in the middle. The storage yards are re-configured, they're actually wrapping the parking, there's going to be some landscaping along Route 9W.

MR. ARGENIO: What's in the storage area?

MR. V. YANNONE: Trucks.

MR. R. YANNONE: Plow trucks, if he has a car for service it will be parked there.

MR. ARGENIO: But you have no more of the outside parts storage business?

MR. R. YANNONE: And sheds, sheds were out there.

MR. ARGENIO: What about the parts storage, didn't you just get done saying there's racks with car parts?

MR. R. YANNONE: Steel containers.

MR. ARGENIO: Steel containers with car parts?

MR. R. YANNONE: Yes, everything is enclosed right now. So it will be removed as I said and the gates, this area will be used for his trucks and vehicles that he uses.

MR. V. YANNONE: Have to keep one container for parts.

MR. R. YANNONE: And then there will be a landscaped area across Route 9W, a gate in front, a gate in the rear secondary yard in the back again access through here, there will be a little recess in the building and a walkway so you would be able to walk out from the office or the shop to this rear yard without going through the slot car area. Right now there's a drainage ditch that runs along the back, everything's pretty much grade to that ditch. It's, the topo is not



going to change, everything is as it is now, just trying to remove as many of these little buildings and storage items that are on the property and try to create some kind of a reasonable--

MR. ARGENIO: What's the total size of the parcel?

MR. R. YANNONE: It is 30,900 square feet.

MR. ARGENIO: Going to pave the parking lot?

MR. R. YANNONE: It's mostly paved now, you're basically adding pavement from about this line through here, the storage areas are going to remain Item 4.

MR. SCHEIBLE: What's going to be in the gravel fence storage area up to the upper left there?

MR. R. YANNONE: This area?

MR. SCHEIBLE: No, upper left.

MR. V. YANNONE: That's going to be like the garbage cans will be back here and I have to have a room for tires, old tires, pickups and stuff like that.

MR. SCHEIBLE: So that's what kind of fencing so it's not visible, you're just talking about putting garbage cans and old tires in there, it's got to be out of site.

MR. R. YANNONE: There's a chain link fence around the perimeter now, is that screened?

MR. V. YANNONE: Some of it is.

MR. R. YANNONE: This would be new fencing here.

MR. ARGENIO: Mark, you have some comments on this? Ray, did you get a copy of this?

MR. R. YANNONE: No.

MR. ARGENIO: There's a lot going on here.

MR. EDSALL: Most of the comments just deal with clarifying some things on the plans and such as the addition area and providing some details but nothing that's impacting the ability to use the property as they proposed. I think some of the planning board members' comments about the type of fencing fit nicely with my comments and the use of the gravel fence storage. My only concern would be the proximity back to those mobile home units, we've just got to treat that appropriately so you may want to explore where the parts containers that Vin said he was going to want to keep one.

MR. ARGENIO: I just want to say this, I want to read Mark's comment, Ray, understood that there are existing improvements that exist on the site that are not shown on the plan, also it would be helpful to know what the existing conditions are otherwise at the site. Demolition of the existing items should be shown on the plans and it should be clear what's existing to remain versus existing to remove versus existing to be relocated as shown. Certainly Mr. Yannone is a long time businessman in the area and he's been there as long as I can remember and I grew up in this town from day one but there's some things that we do need to do in order to maintain consistency with any application, Ray, you've been here a hundred times.

MR. R. YANNONE: I did not unfortunately have their--

MR. ARGENIO: We need that, we need that and we need that appropriately labeled saying this is gonna to stay, this is gonna go, this is gonna stay, this is gonna go.

MR. R. YANNONE: I guess we were hoping to get comments to find out what had to be addressed.

MR. ARGENIO: Trying to give you those comments.

MR. R. YANNONE: That way we can come back with a more complete plan.

MR. ARGENIO: I think that's something that's important, you should have a sketch that says this is gonna go, this is gonna stay because you're a salesman, Ray, and you're saying the things that, you know, you need to say while you stand there getting rid of the propane, these are things you know we like to hear, we like to see things cleaned up, spruced up, you know, we like to see things nicer when they leave the planning board than they were when they came here. I don't have to tell you the routine, you've been here 100 times. You're related to the inventor of that.

MR. R. YANNONE: A question, Vinny, will be using cans for garbage as long as he's been there he wants to continue to do that so is a dumpster enclosure mandatory?

MR. ARGENIO: It's not mandatory and I'll tell you what drives a dumpster enclosure are your, if you have a commercial facility, if it generates any quantities of waste you need one. Here's the problem, if we get a, Jennifer gets a phone call from Sportsplex or the neighbor in the back and there's garbage blowing around because you guys aren't doing the right thing, you're gonna have a problem. It's really I don't feel it can't be more basic than that. Mr. Yannone, if you need it only, you know, if you need it or not, if you think you need it, you should have it. Now if this were a restaurant with 2,500 square feet you'd have a dumpster enclosure because we know that a 2,500 square foot restaurant needs a dumpster enclosure but I don't know about slot cars.

MR. SCHLESINGER: Picked up private or public garbage?

MR. V. YANNONE: Town picks it up.

MR. SCHLESINGER: There's things that you need to address, weight, size of the containers, things like that, they're not complaining now, I don't know.

MR. V. YANNONE: They're little cans.

MR. ARGENIO: Do you guys have anything to my right? I feel like I'm doing all the talking here with this.

MR. SCHEIBLE: No, I think what you're saying is right, we should see more.

MR. BROWN: We need--

MR. ARGENIO: I think what's important let us know where the water's going here, that would be important.

MR. R. YANNONE: Drainage?

MR. ARGENIO: Water drainage. And this has to go to county so we can't do anything unfortunately you're within 500 feet of the state highway, did this go yet?

MS. JULIAN: No.

MR. EDSALL: We didn't do a referral because I wasn't sure what additional information you'd want.

MR. ARGENIO: You proceeded very wisely.

MR. EDSALL: My concern is if we send it out to the county prematurely and they come back with a laundry list of comments it slows you down, better off brushing the plan up and sending it in.

MR. CORDISCO: In its current form it's likely to raise more questions than warranted.

MR. ARGENIO: What should happen here is Raymond you should get with Mark and you guys should talk about some of the things that we talked about here that need to be added to the plan and Mark is truly speaking correctly from that if you send a mess out to the county if it's gray or ambiguous they're going to make a comment on it. And the last thing I need is to be sitting here with a letter from the county with 14 comments on it very seldom happens so if you can get a little bit of guidance from Mark use what we have here tonight, clean the thing up, get up out of here, go do your slot cars. I'd love to see them.

MR. R. YANNONE: We'll incorporate as much as we can and we'll come back to the workshop.

MR. EDSALL: With the board's permission, once they've done that even if it's before they reappear if I have your permission to send it to the county.

MR. ARGENIO: Absolutely, you do.

MR. GALLAGHER: Proposed addition same height as the current building?

MR. R. YANNONE: Yes, actually, what we hope to do once we have a good feeling that this is going to go forward then we're going to have some elevations done and try to tie the roof line together, we may put a, like a layover like a, we're not sure exactly what to give the building a nice look.

MR. ARGENIO: Ray, and I see about the size of the building and I see about the parking, I just assumed that you're meeting zoning based on what I'm seeing here?

MR. R. YANNONE: Yes.

MR. ARGENIO: Am I?

MR. R. YANNONE: There's 23 spaces provided where we have the striped area here and there's 20 required and we didn't include, there's existing spaces on the side of the building now that are being used and striped.

MR. ARGENIO: If you have 23 and you need 20 you're good to go. Okay, what else?

MR. EDSALL: That's all I got.

MR. ARGENIO: Thank you, guys.

MR. R. YANNONE: Thank you very much.

MR. ARGENIO: As soon as you're ready we'll run with this.

MR. R. YANNONE: Thank you.

MR. ARGENIO: Anybody have anything else tonight? Mr. Supervisor, do you have anything?

SUPERVISOR GREEN: As long as Vinny is going to keep servicing the police cars, I don't have anything.

MR. ARGENIO: Motion to adjourn?

MR. BROWN: So moved.

MR. SCHLESINGER: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. SCHEIBLE	AYE
MR. BROWN	AYE
MR. GALLAGHER	AYE

March 24, 2010

47

MR. SCHLESINGER	AYE
MR. ARGENIO	AYE

Respectfully Submitted By:

Frances Roth  
Stenographer

